TEXELENE UDD., OSICINAT



Robert W. Quinn, Jr.

Director - Federal Government Affairs

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Suite 1000 1120 20th St., NW Washington, DC 20036 202 457-3851 FAX 202 457-2545

April 1, 1998

RECEIVED

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N. W., Room 222 Washington, D. C. 20554

APR - 1 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: Ex Parte, CC Docket No. 96-98, RM 9101 - Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Roman Salas:

On Tuesday March 31, 1998, Jim Grudus, Joan Marsh, Susan Faccenda, and I of AT&T met with Michael Pryor, Jake Jennings, Jason Oxman and Andrea Kearney of the Common Carrier Bureau's Policy and Program Planning Division to discuss information regarding Ameritech's Operational Support Systems as well as the communications that AT&T has had to date with Ameritech with respect to obtaining combinations of network elements. Attached are several documents distributed during the presentation.

Two copies of this Notice are being submitted on the following business day to the Secretary of the FCC in accordance with Section 1.1206(a)(1) of the Commission's rules.

Attachments

cc:

J. Jennings

J. Oxman

M. Pryor


A. Kearney

No. of Copies rec'd

List A B O D E

Lobert Quan/mm

30 South Wacker Drive Floor 39 Chicago, IL 50606 Office 312/750-5367 Fax 312/609-6307



John T. Lonation Assistant General Counsel

<u>VIA FAÇŞIMILE AND U.S. MAIL</u>

October 17, 1997

William A. Davis II
AT&T
Chief Regulatory Counsel
13th Floor
227 West Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Bill:

This responds to your letter to me dated October 8, 1997, which I received on October 14, 1997. You asked for Ameritech's written position regarding the so-called UNE Platform.

Bill, AT&T has been fully aware of Ameritech's legal position regarding the UNE Platform: the UNE Platform, as defined by AT&T, is inconsistent with the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and not required by the interconnection agreements between our companies.

As I represented to you and to Len Cali, Ameritech agreed to work to implement the UNE Platform during the time this issue remained unresolved on appeal. Our agreement to work with AT&T, however, was with the express and mutual understanding that neither party was waiving its legal rights. As such, your apparent surprise at Ameritech's decision to "litigate" this issue is puzzling. The fact of the matter is that the legality of your vision of the UNE Platform has been the subject of litigation since at least the August 8, 1996 release of the FCC's First Report and Order in Docket 96-98.

The Order on Petitions for Rehearing of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, filed on October 14, 1997, now resolves the platform issue.



William A. Davis II October 17, 1997 Page Two

As the Court held in granting certain petitions for rehearing, including Ameritech's:

Section 251(c)(3) requires an incumbent LEC to provide access to the elements of its network only on an unbundled (as opposed to a combined) basis. Stated another way, § 251(c)(3) does not permit a new entrant to purchase the incumbent LEC's assembled platform(s) of combined network elements (or any lesser existing combination of two or more elements) in order to offer competitive telecommunications services.

As I understand it, AT&T's "assume-as-is" UNE Platform involves access to existing assembled network elements on a combined — as opposed to an unbundled — basis. As such, AT&T's version of the UNE Platform is inconsistent with Section 251(c)(3), and clearly outside the scope of our interconnection agreement.

Therefore, continued implementation discussions regarding AT&T's UNE Platform do not seem productive. Ameritech recommends, however, that we begin discussions regarding AT&T's access to unbundled network elements under our interconnection agreement in a manner consistent with the Act and the Eight Circuit's Opinion. Such discussion should be coordinated with AT&T's account management team, which I assume will occur in the normal course of business.

Bill, if you would like to discuss our legal position in further detail, feel free to give me or Mike Karson (312/867-5568) a call.

Sincerely,

lohn T. Lenahan

JTL:pli

c: Neil Cox

Mike Karson

C:VLENAHANY1152.doc



William A. Davis II
Chief Regulatory Counsel
Central Region

. The state of the

> 13th Floor 227 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606 312 230-2636

October 23, 1997

John T. Lenahan, Esq.
Assistant General Counsel
Ameritech
30 South Wacker Drive, Floor 39
Chicago, IL 60606

Dear John:

I have your response of October 17, 1997 to my letter of October 8, 1997 concerning the UNE Platform. Obviously our companies have on-going differences that are incapable of being resolved in correspondence between the two of us, but I will respond briefly to your letter and address the question of how we may best pursue platform issues going forward.

I am puzzled by your statement that AT&Ts version of the UNE Platform is both inconsistent with Section 251(c) of the Act and "clearly outside the scope of our interconnection agreement." I understand your citation to the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals' decision of October 14, 1997 in connection with the first point (and as noted we will continue to differ on the merits of that reading of the Act); at the same time, however, there exists clear state law basis for the platform in a number of our states (e.g., Michigan, Illinois). Moreover, as to the scope of the interconnection agreements, I wonder whether and how your position takes into account Schedule 9.5, Sec.1.17, which provides:

"When AT&T orders Network Elements or Combinations that are currently interconnected and functional and remain interconnected to the same adjacent Network Elements, such Network Elements and Combinations will remain interconnected and functional without any disconnection or disruption of functionality of such Network Elements. There shall be no charge for such interconnection. Consequently, for Ameritech retail Customers who simply wish to switch their local service providers and keep the same type of service provided through the same equipment, this method of ordering will accomplish this with no physical changes required in the existing Network Elements. Under these circumstances, it shall not be necessary for AT&T to collocate



John T. Lenshan, Esq. Page Two October 23, 1997

1

. . .

equipment in Ameritech Central Offices to connect the unbundled Network Element. If shared Network Elements are used, Ameritech will be responsible for all engineering, provisioning and maintenance of these components to ensure they support the agreed-upon grade of service."

Among the network "combinations" which Ameritech agreed to provide pursuant to Section 9.3.4, of course, is the "Unbundled Element Platform with Operator Services and Directory Assistance." We read these sections of the interconnection agreement to provide expressly for AT&T's version of the UNE Platform, and I am therefore at a loss as to how Ameritech can reconcile these provisions with its position that the AT&T UNE Platform is "outside the scope" of our agreement.

In any event, and without prejudice to our legal positions, AT&T is prepared to pursue discussions of UNE Platform issues – including Ameritech's proposed approach to UNE availability in light of the 8th Circuit's ruling – from an operational and business perspective. In particular, AT&T will need to know with specificity just how Ameritech proposes to make each UNE available to requesting carriers on a separated basis in a manner that will allow those requesting carriers to combine such elements. Bruce Bennett will be taking up these issues, consistent with your suggestion, in discussions with Ameritech's AT&T account management team.

Sincerely,

William A. Davis, II

cc: Neil Cox, Esq. Mike Karson, Esq.

bcc: Len Cali

Bruce Bennett



Bruce C. Bennett Director of Product Delivery 25th Floor 227 W Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606-5016 312 230-3312 FAX 312 230-4886

November 14, 1997

VIA FACSIMILE

Daniel J. Kocher, Director Planning and Implementation Ameritech 350 North Orleans, 3rd Floor Chicago, Illinois 60654

Dear Dan.

In our November 6, 1997 meeting we discussed certain operational issues associated with Ameritech's proposed methods for making UNEs available to CLECs, assuming the 8th Circuit Court decision is not overnamed. Ameritech's response, in general, was that the CLECs would be required to recombine Network Elements in collocation space purchased on terms and conditions per the Interconnection Agreement. This letter sets forth AT&T's understanding of Ameritech's requirements based on our discussions and seeks your confirmation of our understanding. Also, AT&T is submitting additional questions to better understand Ameritech's operational plans and requirements for recombined UNEs. Ameritech agreed to respond to in writing to additional questions on UNE recombining.

Listed below are the questions AT&T asked Ameritech in our meeting and the Ameritech responses as we understand them:

1. What are the elements Ameritech will offer to CLECs on an unbundled basis?

Ameritech will keep the loop and NID connected and will not provide a loop without a NID. The elements Ameritech will make available are: loop and NID combined, local switching including signaling inherent in the switch (including access to databases), transport — both dedicated and Ameritech's version of "shared", tandem switching, tandem transport and OS/DA.

2. How will CLECs be required to recombine the elements?

Ameritech requires CLECs to combine elements in collocation space. Each CLEC will require collocation space in each central office, including tandem offices, in order to recombine UNEs. At the Main Distribution Frame, Ameritech will "disconnect" an existing loop when a CLEC furnishes a valid customer request for service. Ameritech would establish jumpers for both the loop and switch side connection on Ameritech's Main Distribution Frame ("MDF"). An Ameritech-approved third party vendor would be required to establish the connection between the collocation cage and Ameritech's MDF. The CLEC will establish its own MDF in its collocation cage and will be responsible for physically cross-connecting loop jumpers and line port jumpers on its MDF. Ameritech indicated that



a CLEC may make all the connections within its cage at one time. Additionally, Ameritech indicated that an Intermediate Distribution Frame ("IDF") connection between its MDF and the collocation cage may also be required in some central offices. Ameritech said it would not utilize a common frame outside of the collocation space to terminate multiple CLECs' cross-connects. Moreover, cross-connection of Ameritech switching with dedicated transport trunks would be performed in the collocated space under Ameritech's definition of "shared" transport.

3. Does Ameritech allow CLECs to share the same interoffice transport used by Ameritech?

No. A CLEC purchasing UNE interoffice transport will be purchasing dedicated interoffice trunks and cannot simultaneously use the same interoffice transport used by Ameritech.

4. Can CLECs purchase Ameritech's "shared" transport in quantities smaller than a full trunk group?

The lowest quantity currently negotiated and practically implemented for interconnection is the DSI level. Upon request. Ameritech will split the "shared" transport bill for a DSI among sharing CLECs.

5. How does Americach complete a line assignment for its existing customers?

A physical disconnection and reconnection often is not necessary when an existing loop is assigned to an Ameritech customer; rather. Ameritech is able to accomplish this task via an electronic (keyboard) input.

6. Does a CLEC have to purchase signaling separate from switching?

No. On the line side, the line card has signaling as an embedded function. On the trunk side, a CLEC can purchase either MF or SS7 trunks. The basic signaling capability is inherent in the switch; signaling is not ordered separately if switching is ordered. This basic signaling capability includes access to the Ameritech databases (i.e. 800/888, 911, LIDB, etc. dambases). A CLEC purchasing switching and SS7 trunks does not have to purchase separate access to Ameritech's signaling network and associated databases. Signaling includes both TCAP and ISUP signaling.

7. When will Ameritech's unbundled elements ordering guide be updated to reflect the 8th circuit court ruling?

Ameritech promised to furnish a date for updating its unbundled ordering guide. (AT&T posed this question to our Ameritech Account Manager on 10/23/97 and is still waiting for an answer. Ameritech has a message on its WEB site indicating that the unbundled ordering guide will be updated to reflect the 8th Circuit Court ruling).

8. Will Ameritech silow CLECs to recombine UNEs without collocation? Is Ameritech combining clements today via a remote terminal?

Ameritech requires collocation for CLEC recombining of UNEs. For the vast majority of Ameritech's own customers, service is provisioned via a software update using a remote terminal. Ameritech makes a physical connection to provide service only for new lines (e.g. second lines).

9. Are there ways that CLECs can have direct access to the Ameritech MDF? Is there software to recombine without a physical reconnection?

Ameritath does not anticipate providing CLECs direct access to Ameritath equipment. Ameritath has not given any thought to a software- based method of recombining separate elements.

Dan Kocher November 14, 1997 Page 3

10. What happens if Ameritech does not have sufficient room to accommodate collocation in a specific central office?

Under these circumstances. Ameritech would allow virtual collocation, and would require Ameritech escort of the CLEC technician to perform work on the virtually collocated equipment.

11. Can CLECs prowire in a collocation space?

Ameritech will not prohibit a CLEC from prewiring in its collocated space. A CLEC can also prewire all of its tie lines to and from the MDF (or IDF where one exists) at one time.

12. How will Ameritech ensure coordination of the loop and line port connections for each CLEC customer service order?

The CLEC would have to specify the physical appearances of the loop and switch line port on the individual orders: Ameritech has processes in place to coordinate the separate orders required for the loop and the line port on the switch.

13. How many loop and line port jumper connections could Ameritech complete in a single day?

Ameritech indicated there is a physical limit to the number of conversions which can be done in any given day because of the manual effort involved, but was not able to quantify this limit. To date.

Ameritech has not completed any studies or given any thought to what the maximum number of daily connections would be.

14. Assume a CLEC intends to purchase collocation space solely for purposes of recombining the necessary UNEs into the platform combination, rather than purchasing collocation space for providing facilities-based service, and therefore will not need space for equipment such as light guide equipment: under these circumstances will Ameritech allow the CLEC to purchase collocation space in increments less than 100 square feet?

Yes. Ameritech will reconsider minimum UNE collocation space requirements, and will provide AT&T with a response on this question.

15. Collocation requirements will increase the loop length. If this additional length necessitates loop conditioning, who is responsible for performing the conditioning - Ameritech or the CLEC?

The CLEC is responsible.

16. Will Ameritech provide CLECs access to its engineering records, since the records need to be updated to reflect the new loop length to ensure MLT testing works properly?

As necessary, access to records will be provided. Ameritech said it would investigate MLT impacts of its collocation proposal and will provide AT&T an answer.

17. How does maintenance of the recombined unbundled elements work?

Ameritech has responsibility for the actual maintenance of the elements and the CLEC has responsibility for properly combining the elements. The CLEC must identify and sectionalize the maintenance problem. The CLEC must notify Ameritech which elements are not working properly and Ameritech will initiate corrective action. Ameritech will provide CLECs access to the necessary maintenance tools and diagnostics.

Listed below are additional questions related to Ameritech's requirements for CLECs to recombine unbundled network elements:

- 18. Has Americech developed methods and procedures to describe how it will separate already-combined elements and how CLECs will be required to recombine elements? If not, when will this be done and when will the M&P's be available to CLECs?
- 19. What OSS impacts are anticipated from Ameritech's recombining proposals? What OSS will Ameritech access utilize to separate elements and will CLECs utilize to recombine elements? How will Ameritech provide CLECs access to these OSS?
- 20. What impact does Ameritech's recombining proposal have on engineering and inventory records? What records will Ameritech access or modify to separate already connected elements? What records will need to be accessed and/or updated for a CLEC to complete recombination of UNEs? What is Ameritech's plan to accurately maintain such records? How will multiple CLECs using recombined UNEs be given access to Ameritech's engineering and inventory records?
- 21. Has Ameritech investigated any alternatives to collocation for the recombination of network elements (for example, providing CLECs direct access to Ameritech's network equipment for physical recombining or logical separation and recombining)? If so, what are Ameritech's reasons for not making these alternatives available to CLECs? If not when will this investigation be done?
- 22. Will Ameritath have any restrictions on the number of recombined UNE customers which may be converted to CLECs on a daily basis?
- 23. How quickly can Ameritech install collocation cages in all of the Ameritech Michigan central offices?
- 24. What is the availability of collocated space in each Americach central office? Please describe any limitations which may exist.
- 25. Assuming a CLEC has prewired loop and switch connections in its collocation space to blocks on Ameritech MDF and/or IDF frames, what is the expected duration of customer down time for conversion of an existing Ameritech customer to a UNE CLEC customer?
- 26. How does Ameritech propose to remedy the provisioning/service parity issues associated with its collocation proposal e.g., (1) electronic provisioning vs manual provisioning; (2) additional loop lengths; (3) additional possible points of failure?

Thank you for your cooperation on this matter. If you have any questions I can be reached at (312) 230-3312.

Sincerely.

Bruce Bennett

Yeure Beareth (10)

BB/cv



November 18, 1997

AT&T Corporate Conter 227 West Monroe Chicago, ...nois 50606

Bonnie Hemphill
General Manager - AT&T CLEC Sales
Ameritech Information Industry Services
350 North Orleans. Floor 3
Chicago, Illinois 60654

Dear Bonnic:

As mentioned in my last correspondence to you the AT&T Collocation team would meet to discuss and develop a collocation forecast for Ameritech. At that meeting, several observations were noted which impact the coordination and development of the forecast data which we are to provide to Ameritech. In light of Ameritech's position regarding the 8th Circuit decision on the method of combining network elements, and its insistence upon combining network elements through collocation, the team needs to reconsider the impact on our collocation requirements in Ameritech end offices. Our current collocation data and analysis must now be re-evaluated to determine how to factor in this criterion. Consequently, in order to provide you with an useful forecast, I have requested that the AT&T Collocation team reassess our current forecast data and make the appropriate modifications.

The reassessment and analysis of these revisions would ultimately impact the initial timeframes reflected in Section 6.2.5 (Collocation Planning) of the Implementation Plan. AT&T proposes to provide Ameritech with a two-year rolling revised annually forecast starting on January 20 1998 for the Termination Points. Existing Space, Future LSO's in Existing Market and Future LSO's. We would also submit on a two-year rolling revised Quarterly forecast for Power starting on January 20, April, July, and October respectively. The team has developed forecast templates in which to provide this information to Ameritech (Attachments 1-4). A two-year forecast that does not account for the latest information, in this case consideration of Ameritech's position on the 8th Circuit decision, does not provide it's intended value. Given the dynamic nature of this business it also seems appropriate to consider a six month true up option in the two-year forecast. As of this time however, I can inform you that AT&T has no plans for collocation in Wisconsin or Indiana for 1998. Should that plan change due to our business needs, I will notify you in a timely fashion so as to provide you with adequate time to respond to the requirements.

Your feedback on this proposal is necessary for our team to move forward. If you have any questions or need further clarification regarding the aforementioned I can be contacted at 312-230-2450.

Antoinette Thomas

Copy to: Steve Hunsberger Rhonda Johnson Dan Noorani Rob Polete

Term Polnts Draft

: :

loquirements -	i) Les	Revi	2) Cu	ו אופרון	enni	ration	o, 2) i	nerom	entel :	@ rewr	Úħ.				-
								CY41			CY+2				
			Curre		X		100	- TOTAL	_		 	- Inc	-		ax
4.5		-				1000				GX	1		-	_	
.30	3	031	D23	037	2	DEO	ובטו	033	DSP	E0_	200	ובטו	D23	OSP	50
HCGILAUHOO HCGILCLH32		├—	├─			∤ - -		├	-	├			┼	┼─	┼──
HCGILEDHO1			┼─┈	 		+ -		-	├-	-	 	 	┼	+	┼──
HCGILFRH27			 	+	 	+	 	 	┼	+	 	├	+	┿──	+
HCGILHBH02			 	 	_	 	 	1-	 	 		 	 	 	
CHCGILIDH11		t		1						1				1	1
CHCGILIRHO1															
CHCGILKIHO2			I_{-}								Γ				
CHCGILLRH07			I									$oldsymbol{ol}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}$			
CHCGILLWHO4	<u> </u>		↓	 	┞—		 			<u> </u>	↓		↓	+	↓_
CHCGILMEH02		├	╄—	—	 	┼	├	 	├ —	 —	╄	↓	┼	┼	┼
CHCGILNEH01	 	├	 	}		+	├	 	+	┼	+	} —	 	+	┿
CHCGILRPH02 CHCGILSUH08	<u> </u>	-	┼	┿-	├	┿	 	+	+	┼	+	┼	┼─	+	+
CHCGILCAH01	-	! -	 	+	┼	┿┈	┼	+	┼~	┼	┼─	+-	┼─	+-	+
CHCGILDOH01	├──	 	+	+	┼─	+-	 	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+-
CHCGILLAH02		+	+	 	+	+	+	+-	1	+	+	+	+-	+-	
CHCGILLDH02	 	 	1	1	1	+	 	+	1	+	1	+	+	+-	+
CHCGILMOH93	1	1	+	+	1	1	+-	+	 	+	+	1	+	1	_
CHCGILOKH02					T	1				1			1	1	T
CHCGILW8H23						T						T		\Box	
BLWDILBWHOO												\mathbf{I}		\mathbf{I}	
DWGVILDGH05			<u> </u>		Γ	4_									
EMHRILETHOO	<u> </u>	-	 	4_	↓		1	┵		1	<u> </u>	1_	1_	┦	4_
GENVILONHO2	 	┿	-		+	-		-	+		-	+		_	┿
GLELILGEH01	╄	┼	┿	- 	+	+-	┿		┼	╂	-	+-	 		+-
HNDLILHIHOZ		+	+-	+	┿	+-	+		+	+-	+	╅—	+-		+-
LERDILLMHOS	┼	+	+-	+	+-	+	+-	+	+-	 			+-		-┼
LGRCILLGH02	+-	+	+	+-	┼	╅			+	+-	+-		+-	+	+-
NPVLILNAHO4	${f au}$	+	+	1	+	1	+-	1	1	+-	+	+-	+	+	+-
NPVLIVNEH03	1				1		1	1		\neg	1		_	_	
OKBRILDAHO!															\Box
OKPKILOPH01										\Box			\Box		\Box
RVGVILRGH01		oxdot			II.					1_				\Box	
SMMTILSMH03		4_	4_		4-	┵		_				 			┵
MATHIEWAHO:	4	+-	 		╅	- -	+	-		-		4	—	┿	4
ARLHILAHHOS	+	+	+		+-		+-	+-			+-				+-
DRFDILDFH00	+	+	+-	+-	+			+		+-	+	+	+-	+	+-
LICEPHUS .	+	+-	+-	+-	+-	+-	-	+-	╅	+-	+	-;	+-	+-	+-
NBRKILNBHO4	+	+	+	_		+	+-		-		+-	_	+	_	_
MERKILNTHOS	1	\top			1		1		_			1	1	1	1
WLNGILWGHO	5					\Box									
BNSVILBYHOS					\perp										\Box
CHCGILOHHOS								\perp	\Box						
DOPLILXLHO2					-	_							1	\bot	
EGVCILECHO?	-	+-	+	-	+	-	-				4				+
EVTINILEVHOT	+		+-	+-	+	+	+					+-		-+-	-+-
GLVMLOVIO		+	+-	+	+-	+	+	+-	-	+		+		-	+
MATERIAL MATERIAL		+	+	+	+-	+-	+	+		+-			- -	+	
PRINCILLANI		+	+	+-	+-	-+-	+	+	+		\dashv	+-	+	+	+
SCHOLLCOHO:		\top	_		+-	+	+-	+	+	-	\dashv		+	+	+
SCHOLSPHOO			1		I					1		1		1	丁
SKORLSKHOT			\Box			J	T								丁
WENTELWHOO											\supset		\Box I.		\Box

Pawer Draft

Power Interval-2 Year Rolling Revised Quarterly Requirements - 1) Location, 2) Current Fused Amps, 3) increments: Growth

Current Fused Amps CHCGILAUH00 CHCGILCH32 CHCGILCH32 CHCGILCH01 CHCGILCH12 CHCGILCH11 CHCGILRH01 CHCGILRH01 CHCGILRH01 CHCGILRH07 CHCGILRH07 CHCGILRH07 CHCGILLH07 CHCGILLH07 CHCGILLH07 CHCGILLH07 CHCGILLH00 CHCGILLH00 CHCGILLH00 CHCGILLH00 CHCGILLH00 CHCGILCH01 CHCGILLH00 CHCGILCH01 CHCGILCH01 CHCGILCH01 CHCGILCH01 CHCGILCH02 CHCGILCH02 CHCGILCH02 CHCGILCH02 CHCGILCH02 CHCGILCH00	ſ		CY+1	CY++2
CMCGILCH02 CMCGILCH02 CMCGILCH01 CMCGILFR127 CMCGILFR127 CMCGILFR107 CMCGILM101 CMCGILM101 CMCGILM102 CMCGILM102 CMCGILM102 CMCGILM102 CMCGILM102 CMCGILM103 CMCGILM103 CMCGILM103 CMCGILM103 CMCGILM103 CMCGILM103 CMCGILM103 CMCGILM104 CMCGILM104 CMCGILM104 CMCGILM106 CMCGILM106 CMCGILM106 CMCGILM107 CMCGILM108 CMCGILM1		Current		
CHCGILCH32 CHCGILEH01 CHCGILFH17 CHCGILHH01 CHCGILHH01 CHCGILHH07 CHCGILHH07 CHCGILHH07 CHCGILHH07 CHCGILHH07 CHCGILHH07 CHCGILHH02 CHCGILHH02 CHCGILHH02 CHCGILHH02 CHCGILHH02 CHCGILHH03 CHCGILHH02 CHCGILHH03 CHCGILHH04	LEC	Fueed Amps	Fused Amps	Fused Amps
CHCGILENIO CHCGILFRY27 CHCGILIPH12 CHCGILIPH11 CHCGILIPH11 CHCGILIPH01 CHCGILIPH01 CHCGILIPH02 CHCGILIPH03 CHCGILIPH04 CHCGILIPH04 CHCGILIPH04 CHCGILIPH04 CHCGILIPH04 CHCGILIPH05 CHCGILIPH06 CHCGILIPH06 CHCGILIPH07 CHCGILIPH08 CHCGILIPH08 CHCGILIPH08 CHCGILIPH09 CHCGILI	CHCGILAUH00			
CHCGILFRYZY CHCGILNEHO2 CHCGILNEHO1 CHCGILKHNO2 CHCGILKHNO2 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO6 CHCGILKHNO6 CHCGILKHNO6 CHCGILKHNO6 CHCGILKHNO6 CHCGILCHNO1 CHCGILCHNO1 CHCGILCHNO1 CHCGILCHNO1 CHCGILCHNO2 CHCGILCHNO2 CHCGILKHNO2 CHCGILKHNO2 CHCGILKHNO2 CHCGILKHNO2 CHCGILKHNO3 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO4 CHCGILKHNO6 CHCGILKHNO8 CHCGILKHNO8 CHCGILKHNO8 CHCGILKHNO8 CHCGILKHNO8 CHCGILKHNO6 CHCGILKHNO8 CHCGIL	CHCGILCLH32			
CREGILIMHO	CHCGILEDHOI			
CHCGILIOH11 CHCGILIAH01 CHCGILIAH07 CHCGILLWH04 CHCGILLWH04 CHCGILLWH04 CHCGILLWH04 CHCGILLWH04 CHCGILLWH02 CMCGILLWH02 CHCGILCH01 CHCGILCH01 CHCGILCH02 CHCGILCH02 CHCGILCH02 CHCGILWH03 CHCGILWH03 CHCGILWH03 CHCGILWH04 CHCGILWH04 CHCGILWH04 CHCGILWH04 CHCGILWH04 CHCGILWH05 CHCGILWH05 CHCGILWH06 C	CHCGILFRH27			
CHCGILIAHO1 CHCGILIAHO7 CHCGILIAHO7 CHCGILIAHO7 CHCGILIAHOA CHCGIL	CHCGILH8H02			
CHCGILKHO2 CHCGILKHO7 CHCGILKHO7 CHCGILKHO4 CHCGILKHO6 CHCGILKHO6 CHCGILKHO6 CHCGILKHO6 CHCGILKHO6 CHCGILKHO6 CHCGILCHO1 CHCGILLHO2 CHCGILLHO2 CHCGILLHO2 CHCGILLHO2 CHCGILLHO2 CHCGILLHO2 CHCGILKHO3 CHCGILMO03 CHCGILMO03 CHCGILMO03 CHCGILMO04 CHCGILMO04 CHCGILMO04 CHCGILMO04 CHCGILMO05 CHCGILMO06 CHCGILMO06 CHCGILMO06 CHCGILMO07 CHCGILMO07 CHCGILMO07 CHCGILMO06 CMARILETHO0 GENVILGHO3 CHCGILMO06 CMARILETHO0 CHCRILMO06 CMARILETHO0 CHCRILMO06 CHCRILMON6 CHCRILMO	CHCGILIDH11			
CHCGILLWHO CHCGILLWHO CHCGILLWEHO2 CHCGILNEHO2 CHCGILNEHO2 CHCGILSHOB CHCGILCHOT CHCGILDHO1 CHCGILDHO2 CHCGILLCHO2 CHCGILLWHO3 CHCGILLWHO3 CHCGILLWHO3 CHCGILLWHO3 CHCGILLWHO3 CHCGILLWHO3 CHCGILLWHO2 CHCGILLWHO2 CHCGILLWHO2 CHCGILLWHO3				
CMCGILLWH04 CHCGILMPH02 CMCGILMPH02 CMCGILSH06 CMCGILSH06 CMCGILCAH01 CMCGILCAH01 CMCGILCAH01 CMCGILCAH02 CMCGILCAH02 CMCGILCAH02 CMCGILCAH02 CMCGILCH02 CMCGILCH02 CMCGILMGH03 CMCGILCH004 CMCGILMGH03 CMCGILMGH03 CMCGILMGH03 CMCGILMGH03 CMCGILMGH04 CMCGILMH04 CMCGILMH04 CMCGILMGH04 CMCGILMGH05 CMMRILETH00 GMCMILLMH06 CMCCILLGH01 MLSDILHGH02 CMCCILLGH02 CMCCILLGH03			<u> </u>	
CHCGILMEH02 CHCGILMEH02 CHCGILSUMD8 CHCGILSUMD8 CHCGILLAM02 CHCGILLAM02 CHCGILLAM02 CHCGILLAM02 CHCGILLAM03 CHCGILMOM03 CHCGILMOM03 CHCGILMOM03 CHCGILMOM03 CHCGILMOM04 CHCGILMOM04 CHCGILMOM04 CHCGILMOM05 CHCGILMOM05 CHCGILMOM05 CHCGILMOM06 CHCGILMOM06 CHCGILMOM06 CHCGILMOM06 CHCGILMOM06 CHCGILMOM06 CHCGILMOM06 CHCGILMOM06 CHCGILMOM07 CHCGIL			<u> </u>	
CMCGILNEHO1 CNCGILNEHO2 CHCGILSHINGS CHCGILCAHO1 CHCGILCAHO1 CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO3 CHCGILMOHO3 CHCGILMOHO3 CHCGILWOHO3 CALLICACO1 HLSDILHOHO2 HLSDILHOHO2 LERCILLGHO1 HLSDILHOHO3 CHCGILLGHO1 CHCGILWOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3 SCHULLOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3 SCHULWOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3 CHCCHCCHOTOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3 CHCGILCOHO3			<u> </u>	<u> </u>
CHCGILSUH08 CHCGILSUH08 CHCGILSUH01 CHCGILLOH01 CHCGILLOH02 CHCGILLAH02 CHCGILLAH02 CHCGILLMOH03 CHCGILLMOH03 CHCGILLMOH03 CHCGILLMOH03 CHCGILLMOH03 CHCGILLMOH03 CHCGILLMOH03 CHCGILLMOH04 CHCGILLMOH05 CHCGILLMOH05 CHCGILLMOH05 CHCGILLMOH05 CHCGILLMOH06 CHCGILLMOH06 CMARILETH00 CMERILLGEH01 CHLBDILLMOH02 CLBRDILLMOH06 CLBRDILLMOH06 CLBRDILLMOH06 CHRILLMOH06 CHRILLMOH06 CHRILLMOH06 CHRILLMOH07 CHCRILLMOH07 CHCRILLMOH07 CHCRILLMOH07 CHCRILLMOH07 CHCRILLMOH08 CHCRILLMOH08 CHCRILLMOH09			<u> </u>	
CHCGILSUHOS CHCGILCAHOT CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO3 CHCGILLAHO3 CHCGILLAHO3 CHCGILLWH23 BLWOILBWHO5 DWGVILDGHO5 EMMRILTHO0 GENVILGHHO2 GENVILGHHO2 GENVILGHHO2 GENVILGHHO2 LERDILHHO2 LERDILHHO2 LERDILHHO3 LERDILLHHO3 CHCRILLGHO1 NPVLIVNEHO3 OKERILOAHO1 DKPKILOPHO1 SMMTILSMHO3 VWHTNILWHHO3 ARLHILAHNO5 DRFDILDFHO0 LBVLILLHO3 LJEFRILLFHO2 NBRISILAHO5 NBRISILAHO5 SPENLIFHO3 CHCRILLOHO2 CHCRILLOHO2 CHCRILLOHO3 CHCRILLOHO				
CHCGILCAH01 CHCGILLAH02 CHCGILLAH02 CHCGILLAH03 CHCGILLAH03 CHCGILLAH03 CHCGILLAH03 CHCGILLAH03 CHCGILLAH03 CHCGILLAH03 CHCGILLAH06 CHCGILLAH06 CHCGILLAH06 CHCGILLAH06 BLWDILBWH06 DWGWILDGH06 EMHRILETH00 GENVILGH002 CHLBILLAH08 LGRCILLGH01 HLBDILLAH08 LGRCILLGH02 NPVLILNAH08 CGRCILLGH02 NPVLILNAH08 CGRCILLGH03 CMBRILLAH03 CMBRILOAH01 CMCRILCOH01 SMMTINLWH03 ARLHILAHN03 CMFRILLAH03 CMFRILLHH03 CMFRILLHH03 CMFRILLHH03 CMFRILLHH03 CMFRILLHH03 CMFRILLHH09 CMFRILLHH09 CMFRILLHH09 CMFRILLHH09 CMCRILLOH09 CMCRI			<u> </u>	<u> </u>
CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLMOHO5 CHCGILLCMOHO5 CHCGIL				
CHCGILLAHO2 CHCGILLOHO2 CHCGILLOHO3 CHCGILLOHO3 CHCGILLOHO3 CHCGILLOHO5 CHCGILLOHO6 CHCGILCOHO6 CHCGIL		ļ	 	ļ
CHCGILLOHO2 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLMOHO3 CHCGILLWOHO2 CHCGILLWOHO2 BLWDILBWHO6 DWGVILDGHO6 EMMILETHO0 GEAVILGHO2 GLELILGEHO1 HLBDILLHOHO2 HNDLLHIHO2 LBRDILLMHO6 LGRCILLGHO3 OKERILDAHO1 OKERILDAHO1 OKERILDAHO1 OKERILDAHO1 DKPKILOPHO1 RVGVILRGHO1 SMMTILSHHO3 DRFDILDFHO0 LBV-ILLHHO3 DRFDILDFHO0 LBV-ILLHHO3 DRFRILLAHO5 DRFDILDFHO0 LBV-ILLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBRKILNSHO4 NBRKILNSHO4 NBRKILNSHO5 CHCGILDHOO GEPLISLHO3 CHCGILCHOO GEPLISLHO3 CHCGILCHOO GEPLISLHO3 CHCGILCHOO GEPLISLHO3 CHCGILCHOO GEPLISLHO3 CHCGILCHOO3 SEPRILEPHO			 	
CHCGILMOH03 CHCGILLOKH02 EHCGILLOKH02 EHCGILWOH05 EMMRILETH00 GENVILGH05 EMMRILETH00 GENVILGNH02 GENVILGNH02 GENVILGNH02 UBRDILLMH002 UBRDILLMH08 LURDILLMH08 LURDILLMH03 OKBRILOAH01 OKPVILIVAH04 NPVLIVNEH03 OKBRILOAH01 OKPVILIVHH03 ARLHILAHN03 WHTTNILWHH03 ARLHILAHN05 DRFDILDFH00 LBVLILIH003 LKFRILLFH02 NBRKILNBH04 NBRKILNBH04 NBRKILNBH04 NBRKILNBH05 SBRSVLBVH05 CHCGILOH00 OBPLIZH062 SSTRILEY-01 CLLWHLOVH05 HFSSLWLH02 ARGUNAGNO2 FRAGILSCH07 EVTNILEY-01 CLLWHLOVH05 HFSSLWLH02 ARGUNAGNO2 FRAGILXCH01 SCEGILCOH03 SSCEGILCOH03 SSCEGILCOH03 SSCEGILCOH03 SSCEGILCOH05		 		}
CHCGILLWH23 ELWOILEWH06 DWGVILDGH06 EMMRILETH00 GENVILGNH02 GLEILGEH01 HLBDILHOH02 HNDLIMH02 LBRDILLMH08 LGRCILLGH02 NPVLIVNEH03 OKBRILOAH01 OKPKILOAH01 OKPKILOH01 SMMTILSHH03 UN-TTNILWH03 ARLHILAH03 UN-TTNILWH03 LBVLILHH03 LBVLILHH03 LBVLILHH03 LBVLILHH03 LBVLILHH03 CRERKILNH06 NBRKILNH06 NBRKILNH06 VALNGILWGH05 ORBRILDH00 CBVLILLH02 CBVLILLH02 CBVLILLH03 CBVLILLH04 CBV				 -
EMCGILWBH23 BLWOLIBWH06 DWGVILDGH05 EMMRILETH00 GEMYILGNH02 GLELILGEH01 HLBDILHOH02 HNDLILHIH02 LBRDILLMH06 LGRCILLGH03 OKPKILOPH03 OKPKILOPH01 RVGVILRGH01 SMMTILSMH03 UNITNILWH03 DRFDILDFH00 LBVJLLHH03 LKFRILLFH02 NBRILNBH04 NBRIKLNBH06 SMLSVH05 CHCGLOHH06 CBVJLJLH03 CHCGLICH07 EVYNILEVH01 GLVWLOVH03 HFEELWILDPH00 SECHGLICH03				
BLWDILBWHOS DWGVILDGHOS EMHRILETHOO GENVILGHOO GENVILGHOO GENVILGHOO GLELILGEHOO HUSDILHOHOO HUSDILHOHOO HUSDILHOHOO HUSDILHOHOO HUSDILHOHOO LERDILLMHOS LGRCILLGHOO NPVLILNEHOO OKERILOAHOO OKERILOAHOO OKERILOAHOO OKERILOAHOO OKERILOAHOO OKERILOAHOO OKERILOHOO OKERILOHOO UNTTILWHHOO ARLHILAHNOS DRFDILDFHOO UNTILWHOO UNTILWHOO NERKILNEHOO NERKILNEHOO NERKILNEHOO OKERILNEHOO OKERILOHOO		 		
DWGVILDSHOS EMMRILETHOO GENVILGHNO2 GLELILGEHO1 HUBDILMHOS LERDILMHOS LERDILMHOS LGRCILLGHO2 NPVLILNAHO4 NPVLILVHEHO3 OKERILOAHO1 OKPKILOPHO1 RVGVILRGHO1 SMMTILSHHO3 ARLHILAHHOS DRFDILDFHOO LBVLILLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBRKILNHO3 NBRKILNTHOS NBRKILNHO3 CHCGLICHHOO		 		
EMMRILETHOO GENVILGHMO2 GLEULGEHO1 NLEDILHOHO2 HINDILHHOB LGRCILLGHO2 NPVLILNAHOB LGRCILLGHO2 NPVLILNAHOB NPVLIVNEHO3 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOHO1 RVGVILRGHO1 SIMMTILSMHO3 VW-TTNILWHHO3 ARLNILAHNOS DEFDILDFHOO LBVILLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBRIGLNBHO4 NBRIGLNBHO6 NBRIGLNBHO6 NBRIGLNBHO6 NBRIGLNBHO6 NBRIGLNBHO6 CHCGRLOHHO9 OBPLILXLHO2 ZEWBULBGHO7 EVYNILEVHO1 CALVINGHUO2 NBRIGLNBHO6 NBRIGLNBHO7 EVYNILEVHO1 CALVINGHUO2 NBRIGLNBHO02 NBRIGLNBHO02 NBRIGLNBHOO2 NBRIGLNBHOO				
GENVILGNHO2 GLÉLILGEHO1 HLSDILHOHO2 HNDJILHIHO2 LERDILLMHO8 LGRCILLGHO2 RPVLIVNEHO3 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOHO03 ARLHILAHNO3 DRFDILDFHO0 LBVJILLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBERILLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBERILLHO3 OKERILOHO0		 		
GLÉLILGEN01 MLEDILMON02 HNDULMH02 LERDILLMOB LGRCILLGH02 NPYLIVAH03 OKERILOAH01 OKPKILOPH01 RYGVILRGH01 SMMTILSH03 ARLHLAH03 ARLHLAH03 DRFDILDFH00 LBYLILH03 LKFRILLFH02 NBRKILNBH04 NBRKILNBH04 NBRKILNBH04 NBRKILNBH05 SMBYKILNBH06 SMANGILWGH05 SMBYKILNBH06 SMANGILWGH07 ZYFIILEVH07		 	 	
HILDILHORD HINDLILMINOS LERDILLMINOS LERCILLGHO2 NPYLINANOS NPYLIVAENOS NPYLIVAENOS OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOAHO1 OKERILOHO0 KYBYILRGHO1 SMMTILSMINOS VIITTIILWINOS ARLHILAHNOS DREDILDEHOO LBYLILLHOS LIKERILLFHOZ NERKILNEHOS NAMIKILNTHOS WANGILWSHOS NAMIKILNTHOS WANGILWSHOS OMENILNYHOS CHCGILOHHOO OBPLILZLHOS ENTRILESHO7 EYTHILEVHO1 ZLVMILGVIOS HINGSLWCOPO SELVANILGVIOS SELVANILGVIOS HINGSLWCOPO SELVANILGVIOS SEL			 	
HNDLILHIHO2 LERDILLMHO6 LGRCILLGHO2 NPYLINANO4 NPYLIVNEHO3 OKERILOAHO1 OKPKILOPHO1 RVSVILRGHO1 SMMTILSMHO3 VHTNILWHHO3 ARLHILAHNO5 DRFDILDFHO0 LBYLILLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBRKILNHO3 NBRKILNTHO6 WLNGILWGHO5 SMESVASVHO5 CHCGLOHKOO CBPLILSLHO2 CHCGLOHKOO CBPLILSLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBRKILNTHO6 WLNGILWGHO5 SMESVASVHO5 CHCGLOHKOO CBPLILSLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 RMSVASVHO5 CHCGLOHKOO CBPLILSLHO3 SKENNLBVHO5 SMESVALBVHO5 SMESVALBVHO5 SMESVALBVHO1 GLVMILGWHO3 HRESELWLHO2 AND WILMGHO2 FRESILSLHO1 SCENILBPHO0 SMESKILCOHO3 SKENILBPHO0 SMESKILCOHO3 SKENILBPHO0 SMESKILCOHO3 SKENILBPHO0 SMESKILCOHO3 SKENILBPHOO SMESKILCOHO3 SKENILBPHOO SMESKILCOHO3 SKENILBPHOO SMESKILGHOSS WLASTILWHO2		†		
LERDILLMHOS LGRCILLGHO2 MPVLINAHO4 NPVLINAHO3 OKERILOAHO1 OKPKILOPHO1 RVGVILRGHD1 SMMTILSMHO3 WI-TTRILWHHO3 ARLHILAHNOS DRFDILDFHOO LBVLILLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBRKILNBHO6 NBRKILNBHO6 NBRKILNBHO6 NBRKILNTHOS SMMSILWHOS SMMSILLHOS				
LGRCILLGH02 NPYLINAH04 NPYLIVNEH03 OKERILOAH01 OKPKILOPH01 RVBVILRGH01 SMMTILSMH03 WHTNILWH03 ARLHILAHN05 DRFDILDFH00 LBYLILLH03 LKFRILLFH02 NBRIKLNBH04 NBRIKLNBH04 NBRIKLNBH06 SMESULWH05 SMESULWH09 OFFLIX.H02 ZEVNILEVN01 ZLVWILOVH03 HISSLWLH02 NBRIKLSH002 PRISILLFH01 SLVWILOVH03 HISSLWLH02 NBRIKLSH01 SESSILLB0103 SESSILLB0103 SESSILLB0103 SESSILLB0103 SESSILLB0103 SESSILLB0103				
MPVLIUNEHO3 OKERILOAHO1 OKPKILOPHO1 RVGVILRGHO1 SMMTILSMHO3 WHTNILWHHO3 ARLHILAHO3 DRFDILDFHO0 LBVLILHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 MFRILLHO3 UKFRILLFHO2 MFRILLHO3 CKFRILLFHO2 MFRILLATHO6 VANGILWGHO5 CHCGILOHHO9 OBPLILZUMO2 EVINERVANO3 CLUMICOVHO3 HIS SLWLHO2 MINISTRUMBO2 PRINISTRUMBO2 PRINISTRUMBO3 SEPRILOPHO0 SEPRILOPHO0 SEPRILOPHO0 SEPRILOPHO0 SEPRILOPHO0 SEPRILOPHO0 SEPRILOPHO0		 		1
OKERILOAHO1 OKPKILOPHO1 RVGVILRGHO1 SMMTILSMHO3 WHTNILWHO3 ARLHILAHOS DRFDILDFHO0 LBVLILLHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NERRILAHO4 NERRILAHO6 WANGILWGHD5 CHCGILOHHO0 OBPLILLHO2 EMMILESHO7 EVTRILEVIO1 CLVWLOVHO3 HPESLWLHO2 ANGRILWGHO2 ANGRILWGHO2 MERRILAHO2 EMMILESHO7 EVTRILEVIO1 CLVWLOVHO3 HPESLWLHO2 ANGRILAGHO2 PRINCIPHO0 SECRILOHO3 SECRILOHO3 SECRILOHO3 SECRILOHO3 SECRILOHO3 SECRILOHO3 MARTILVWHO2			1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
OKPKILOPHO1 RVSVILRGHD1 SMMTILSMHO3 WHTNILWHO3 ARLHILAHNO3 DRFDILDFHO0 LBVLILIHO3 LMFRILLFHO2 MBRILLFHO2 MBRILLFHO5 SMBVILWGHD5 SMBVILWGHD5 CHCGILDHHO0 OBPLILXLHO2 EMMILEGHO7 EVTHILEVHO1 CLVWLGVHO3 HPESLWLHO2 MARGILWGHO2 MARGILWGHO2 MARGILWGHO3 SCHOLBGHO2 MARGILWHO2 MARGILWHO2 MARGILWHO2 MARGILWHO2 MARGILWHO2 MARGILWHO2 MARGILWHO2 MARGILWHO2 MARGILWHO3 SCHOLBCHO3 SCHOLBCHO3 SCHOLBCHO3 SCHOLBCHO3	NPVLIVNEHO3			
RVGVILRGHO! SMMTILSMHO3 WHTNILWHHO3 ARLHILAHNOS DRFDILDFHOO LBVLILIHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBRISLNBHO4 NBRISLNBHO4 NBRISLNBHO4 NBRISLNBHO5 GAGULBVHO5 CHCGILDHHOO CMPLILXLHO2 EBVOILEGHO7 EVTNILEVHO1 CLVWLGVHO3 NBRISLWLHO2 NBRISLWLHO3 SCENILSHHOO SECNILSHHOO SECNILSHHOO SECNILSHHOO	OKBRILOAH01			
SMMTILSMHO3 WHTNILWHHO3 ARLHILAHNOS DRFDILDFHOO LBYLILIHO3 LKFRILLFHO2 NBRKILNBHO4 NBRKILNTHOS WANGILWGHD5 SMSVELVYO5 CHCGILOHHOO DBYLIXLHO2 ZSVGILEOHO7 EVYNILEVYO1 ZLIVMLOVHO3 HMESLWLHO2 ARGULMGHO2 PRINCLMGHO2 PRINCLMGHO3 SEPRILOPHO0 SMESQLEGOHO3 SEPRILOPHO0	OKPKILOPHO1			
WHTNILWHHOS ARLHILAHNOS DRFDILDFHOO LBVLILLHOS LKFRILLFHOZ MORKILNBHO4 MORKILNBHO4 MORKILNTHOS WANGILWGHDS OMFVLEVHOS CHCGILOHHOO CHPLIXXHOZ ZEVORILEOHOS RUSULBONOS HITSILWHOZ PRINCLOHOS SEPRILOHOO SECRICOHOS SEPRILOHOO SECRICOHOS SEPRILOHOO SECRICOHOS SECRICOHOS SECRICOHOS SECRICOHOS SECRICOHOS SECRICOHOS SECRICOHOS SECRICOHOS	RVOVILRGH01			
ARLHILAHNOS DRFDILDFHOO LBVLILLHOS LKFRILLFHOZ MBRISLNBHO4 MBRISLNBHO4 MBRISLNBHO5 MANGILWGHD5 MANGILWGHD5 CHCGR DHHOO CBPLIXLHOZ ZEVBILEGHO7 EVTNILEVHO1 CLIVWILOVHOS HIPSILVAHOZ ARBSILLMHOOZ PRISILVAHOZ ARBSILLMHOOZ PRISILVAHOZ MARTILVAHOZ WLAFTILVAHOZ	SMMTILSMHO3			
DRFDILDFH00 LBVLILLIH03 LDFRILLFH02 MBRILLEH02 MBRILLMBH04 MBRILLMTH08 WANGILWGHD5 EMEWILBVH05 CHCGILCHH00 CBPLIZZH02 ZBVGILEGH07 EVTNILEVH01 CZLVWILOVH03 HUTSLVVLH02 MBRILLMGH02 PRINCLWH01 SCEGILCOH03 SEPRILBPH00 SEPRILBPH00 SEPRILBPH00 SEPRILBPH00	WHTNILWHH03			
LINFRILLEHO2 NBPRILLEHO2 NBPRILLEHO4 NBPRILLNTHOS VALNGILWGHD5 SNEWLBVHO5 CHCGILCHHO9 OBFLIXLHO2 ZEVBILEGHO7 EVTNILEVHO3 HIPSELWLHO2 NBRULMGHO2 PRINCLMGHO2 NBRULMGHO2 NBRULMGHO2 NBRULMGHO2 NBRULMGHO2 NBRULMGHO3 SEPRILEPHO0 SREGICCHO3 SEPRILEPHO0 SREGICEROD3	ARLHILAHH05			
INFRILLFHOZ NEPRILLNEHOA NEPRILLNEHOS VANGILWGHDS SMEVELEVHOS CHCGILOHHOO OBPULIZHOZ ZIVOLEGHO7 EVYNILEVHO1 GLVWLGVHO3 HATESLWLHO2 MERGILXILHO2 MERGILXILHO1 SCEGILCOHO3 SEPRILEPHO0 SECRICOHO3 SEPRILEPHO0 SECRICOHO3 WARTILWHOZ				
NBPRILINGHOA NBPRILINTHOS WANGILWGHDS SMEWBLEVHOS CHCGILOHHOO OBPLILIANOZ ESWOLEGHO7 EVYRILEVHO1 GLVWLGVHO3 HMESLWLHO2 NBRIGLXILHO2 NBRIGLXILHO1 SCEGILCOHO3 SCEGILCOHO3 SCEGILCOHO3 SCEGILCOHO3 SCEGILCOHO3 SCEGILCOHO3 SCEGILCOHO3		 		
NBPIKILATHOS WANGILWGHDS BNEWLEVHOS CHCGILOHHOO OBPLILIZANOS ENVINLESHOT EVTNILEVHOS GLVWLOVHOS HIESLWLHOS NINGVILMGHOS SCEGILCOHOS				
WANGILWGHDS SHEVELBYHOS CHCGILOHHOO OBPULIZAHOZ SHVBILESHOT EVYNILEVHOS PARTILWHOS MARTILWHOS SEPRILEPHOO SHCHGLISHOS WANTILWHOS WANTILWHOS		 		
CHCGILOHHOO OBPLILIZHOS GOMBILESHOT EVTHILEVHOI CLVMILOVHOS HITSELWLHOS AMBULLMGHOS PHISELWLHOS SCEGILCOHOS		 		
CHCGILDHHOO OBPLILIZHOO OBPLILIZHOO EMMILEGHOO EVTHILEVHOO CLIVMILOVHOO HIMBELIZHHOO MAGULIANGHOO MAGULIZHHOO SCEGILCHHOO SCEGILCHHOO SCEGILCHHOO SCEGILCHHOO SCEGILCHHOO SCEGILCHHOO				
COMPLICATION SEMBLESHOT EVTNILEVHOT CLVWILOVHOS HIMSELWLHOS AMEDILAGHOS PINISLELHOS SCEGILCOHOS		 		
ENVOILEGHO7 EVTNILEVHO1 CLYMILOVHO3 HHISELWLHO2 AMBOULMGHO2 PRINGLELHO1 SCENILOPHO0 SECNILOPHO0 SECNILOPHO0 SECNILOPHO2	CALCUMNUS			 -
EVTNLEVA01 SILVMLOVH03 HMSSLWLH02 AMSULMSH02 PMSSLXLH01 SICEGILCOH03 SICHULSPH00 SICHULSPH00 SICHULSH0103			+	+
CALVANLOVHOS HATSELWLHOS AMAGULMGHOS PRESILCOHOS SCHWLAPHOO SWANGLEROHOS WLATTLWHOS		+	+	
HMSSLWLH02 AMSSILMSH02 PMSSLXLH01 SCEGILCOH03 SCHWLSPH00 SWENGLKH0BS				
MARGULMGRO2 PHROSEXELHO1 SCEGILCOHO3 SEPRILEPHRO SRESIGLEROIDS WLAFTILWHO2		 		
PRINTSLUKLHO1 SCESILCOHO3 SEPRILOPHOO SIKSIGLEROHO3 WLATTLWHO2		 		
SCHOLOHO3 SCHOLOHO0 SIGGLEROIDS WLATTLWHO2	PROBLEM XU-ID1	1		
SEPHILIPHIO SIBBIGLEROIDS WENTILWHOZ		 		
WARTILWHO2		1		
WALANTILWHO2	SECONDA SECONDA			
		 		
Tama i Miradauga	WHITKILWNHO3	 		-1

Spate Draft

Spece interval-2 Year Rolling Revised Annually Requirements - 1) Location, 2) Current Square Feet 3) Incremental Growth in Square Feet, 4) Current 8 of Bays, 5) Incremental Growth in Baye

		Physical		Virtual				
		CY-1	CY+2		CY+1	CY+2		
Į.	Current	incremental	Incremental	Current	incremental	Incremental		
	Squere	Square	Square	# of	# of	# of		
30	Feet	Foot	Feet	Bers	Seys	Baye		
CHCBILAUHOO								
HCGILCUI32		}		 				
CHCGILEDHOI						 		
CHCGILFRH27			 			 		
CHCGILHBH02			-			[
		 	 	 		 		
CHEDILIDHII		}			ļ	 _		
CHCGIURHO1				ļ		 		
CHCGILKIH02		ļ	 			 		
CHCGILLAHO7		 	ļ 	 	 	 		
CHEBILLWARD		 	ļ	 	<u> </u>	}		
		 	 	 	<u> </u>	 		
CHEGILMEHOI		 				 		
CHCGILAPHOZ		 	 		 	{		
CHCGILSUHOS		 	 		 -	 -		
CHEGILEAHOI			 	├	 	 		
CHCGILDOHO1		 	 	 	-	 		
CHCGILLAH02			 			 		
CHEGILLDHOS			 		 	 		
CHCGILMOH03								
CHCGILOKH02			<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	4		
CHCGILWBH23		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1				
BLWOILEWHOS			1			<u> </u>		
DWGVILDGHOS		L						
EMHRILETHOO								
DENNLGNH02								
GLELLGEN01								
HLSDILHDH02								
HNDLILHIMO2				T				
LERDILLMHOS								
LGRCILLGH02		1						
NPVLILNAHOL	T							
NPVLIVNEHD3								
OKBRILDAHO1	Ţ			1				
OKPKILOPHO!	1			1		1		
RVGVILRGH01				1				
SMMTILSMHO3				1		7		
WHITHILLWHHOO			1	1		1		
ARLHILAMHOS	1		7	1	1	1		
DRFDILDFHOO	1			+		1		
LEVLILLIHOS	1			+	 	1		
LIFRILLEHOZ	1	1	1	+	 	 		
NERSULNSHOA	1		1	+	 			
NAMED IN THOS	1			1		1		
WINGILWIGHOS	5	1		+	 	1		
BREVILEVIOS	1	1	 	1				
CHCOLLOHHOS	1		1		 	 		
DEPULKLHO2	1					 		
EN SILEGHO?	1	+		+				
EVTHILEVHOT	1	+	+	+		+		
GLANNLGV1103	1	1		+		+		
HFEELUNLH92	1		+	+	 	+		
			+					
MINISTER SHOP	+			+				
A COUNTY	1							
SCHOLSPHO	+	+			+			
35 G 4 10 63		 	+	+				
WEST IN CONTROL	+					- -		
WALTEST WANTED								
Late STF and Mr.	-1							

Future LSO's Draft

Future LSO's in Existing Markets
Interval-2 Year Rolling Revised Annually
Requirements - 1) State, 2) Geographical Area, 3) Current LSO's,
4) Incremental Growth

State	Existing Market	Current # LSO's	CY+1 Incremental # LSO's	CY+2 Incremental # LSO's
(Illinois				
Indiana				
Michigan				
Ohio-				
Wisconsin				

Future LSO's

Interval-2 Year Rolling Revised Annually

Requirements - 1) Current LSO's in the Five Ameritech States,

3) Incremental Growth

|--|



Bruce C. Bennett Director or Product Delivery 25th Floor 227 W. Monroe Street Chicago, IL. 60606-5018 312 230-3312 FAX 312 230-8886

December 16, 1997

VIA FACSIMILE AND US MAIL

Daniel J. Kocher, Director Planning and Implementation Ameritech 350 North Orleans, 3rd Floor Chicago, Illinois 60654

Dear Dan.

I am following up on the status of a response to my November 14, 1997 letter (attached) I sent you following our November 6, 1997 meeting. Included in the letter is a series of questions we asked Ameritech at the meeting and AT&T's understanding of Ameritech's responses. We also included questions related to Ameritech's requirements for CLECs to recombine unbundled network elements which were not specifically addressed at the meeting. It has been over a month since I sent you the letter which Ameritech agreed to respond to in writing, and I have not received a response. We would really appreciate Ameritech's answers to these questions as quickly as possible.

If you should have any questions or would like to discuss anything I can be reached at (312) 230-3312. Thank you in advance for your cooperation on this matter.

Sincerely,

Bruce Bennett

BB/cv

Attachment

cc: Bonnie Hemphill





Bruce C. Bennen Director of Product Delivery 25th Floor 227 W. Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606-5016 312 230-3312 FAX 312 230-8666

January 28, 1998

VIA FACSIMILE AND U.S. MAIL

Daniel J. Kocher, Director Planning and Implementation Ameritech 350 North Orleans, 3rd Floor Chicago, Illinois 60654

Dear Dan,

I am following up on the status of a response to my December 16, 1997 and November 14, 1997 letters regarding Ameritech's requirements for CLECs to recombine unbundled network elements. We have not yet received the response you agreed to provide and therefore can only assume that we have correctly characterized Ameritech's position on recombination in the November 14, 1997 letter.

If Ameritech's position on these issues has changed we would greatly appreciate a response to our letter.

Sincerely,

Bruce Bennett

BB/cv

cc: Bonnie Hemphill



Ameritach Information Industry Services

350 N. Orleans. Floor 3 Chicago, Illinois 60654

Phone: 312/335-6559 Fax: 312/335-2927

Ameritech

Bosais Hempbill
Coneral Manager - AT&T

February 10, 1998

Mr. Bruce Bennett
Director of Product Delivery
AT&T
227 W. Monroe, 25th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Door Bruce.

This responds to your letter of November 14, 1997 to Dan Kocher and subsequent correspondence concerning the November 6, 1997 meeting when Dan, Mike Karson and I were invited to speak with Maureen Gerson. Bob Sherry, Bob Falcone and yourself concerning AT&T's ability to combine network elements pursuant to the Eighth Circuit Court's ruling. That meeting was held as a follow-up to John Lenaham's October, 17, 1997 letter.

At that three hour meeting, we described in detail how Ameritach today provides access to network elements and how AT&T could, if it chose to do so, use those existing arrangements to combine those network elements with its own facilities or with other network elements provided by Ameritach to provide telecommunications services. While our discussion dealt with details, the subject matter itself was not new to say of us. The matter in which Ameritach provides access to these network elements has been extensively documented at Ameritach's web site, in our Interconnection Agreement and its associated implementation Plan, and in the thousands of pages filed with Ameritach's two 271 applications.

During the meeting, we emphasized the following points:

- Ameritech has provided other CLECs with access to tens of thousands of unbundled
 loops which have been successfully combined within those carriers' networks to serve
 their customers. Procedures have been established to coordinate the disconnection of
 Ameritech's retail service with the installation of a CLEC's service to minimize any
 customer inconvenience during the transition.
- 2. Ameritach does not dictate to AT&T how network elements that it purchases should be combined. On several occasions Dan Kocher corrected misstantments made by the AT&T representatives that Ameritach was "requiring" AT&T to perform certain functions in combining network elements.
- Although it is obvious that combining network elements as they are currently provided
 can be accomplished in collocation space. Americach is open to negotiate any other

technically feasible alternative that AT&T cares to propose. AT&T indicated that it would be making such a proposal shortly.

Unfortunately, although the morning was established to exchange our respective views of the court's decision, once the meeting started you provided little explanation of AT&T's position on the issue. You stated that you were not authorized to discuss AT&T's views at that time. Several times during the meeting, you or one of the other AT&T representatives indicated that AT&T was preparing alternative arrangements which it intended to formally propose to Ameriteth. As the meeting adjourned, it was Ameriteth's understanding that AT&T would be making those proposals in the near figure. It was to those forthcoming proposals that Ameriteth agreed to respond. Nearly three months have passed since that meeting. To date, Ameriteth not received any proposals from AT&T even though the Eighth Circuit's order was clear that the responsibility to combine network elements rests with AT&T, not Ameriteth.

With regard to the November 14th correspondence, I must admit that there was some puzziement on our part when we received your document when we understood that AT&T was preparing to open negotiations on an alternative proposal to the existing collocation arrangements. Our original intention was to respond when AT&T shared its proposal with us. However, I think it is now obvious that your proposal is delayed. You may refer to the three points listed above as an accurate summary of Ameritech's position and Ameritech's willingness and ability to provide access to network elements so that they can be combined by AT&T(with details provided in the extensive documentation mentioned earlier).

I also believe that AT&T's position command in its forecast letters of November 18, 1997 and December 18, 1997 was disingentious. Since AT&T has steadfastly refused to accept both the UNE platform and shared transport definitions contained in our interconnection Agreement or the Eighth Circuit's rulings, they could have no impact on AT&T's ability to fulfill its contractual obligations for forecasts. In any case, since you now have our response, there should be no further impediment to your forecasting process.

I also note that AT&T has publicly amnounced abandonment of its resale efforts although substantial order volumes continue through our service center. I am curious as to whether this amnouncement, along with the Eighth Circuit's ruling, will result in a changed position vis-a-vis the UNE Platform, which for all intent and purposes was nothing more than resale at TELRIC rates. If you have any information with regard to this situation that you would be willing to share. Amaritach would appreciate it.

Bruce, to the extent you wish to enter into morningful dialogue on your network element combination alternatives, your account team at Americach, stands ready to do so. When you obtain the authorization to discuss these items, please feel free to forward any proposals you wish Americach to consider.

Sincerely, Bonace Kemphell



Bruce C. Bennett Director of Product Delivery 25th Floor 227 W. Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60608-5016 312 230-3312 FAX 312 230-8886

February 27, 1998

VIA FACSIMILE AND U.S. MAIL

Bonnie Hemphill
General Manager
Ameritech Information Industry Services
350 North Orleans
Floor 3
Chicago, IL 60654

Dear Bonnie:

I am in receipt of your February 10, 1998 letter replying to my letter of November 14, 1997. Your letter fails to respond to AT&T's requests – contained in my initial letter and reiterated in follow-up correspondence on December 16, 1997 and January 28, 1998 that Ameritech clarify and confirm its position on the manner in which it proposes to make available unbundled UNEs to CLECs, including an explanation of how Ameritech combines UNEs for its own use and how Ameritech will separate UNEs that are currently combined. The information we requested is essential for AT&T to evaluate whether your current collocation-based offering is a reasonable means to combine Ameritech UNEs (loops and switches), as well as to assess possible alternatives.

Your letter attempts to suggest that Ameritech has not responded to my November 14, 1997 letter because it has been waiting for an AT&T proposal. What we agreed to at our November 6, 1997 meeting, however, was that AT&T would summarize in writing what it understood Ameritech's position to be on those questions, and that Ameritech would respond in writing, and that was not fied to any AT&T alternative proposal. If, as you contend, you were "puzzled" by my November 14th letter, presumably you remained puzzled by my subsequent requests for the information, and yet you never called and never responded. If Ameritech had a different understanding, in other words, it was incumbent on Ameritech to respond in some fashion rather than simply remain silent for three months.

Your latest letter, moreover, is not responsive. We fully understand that Ameritech has provided CLECs with their own switches access to your unbundled loops by using collocation to connect to their networks. AT&T's questions were posed to gain an understanding of whether Ameritech's collocation product, designed for connecting UNEs in an environment for CLEC switch providers to access unbundled loops in your network, is reasonable when Ameritech provides both the loops and the switch. As we discussed in our meeting, it is AT&T's view that



Bonnie Hemphill February 27, 1998 Page 2

collocation as a method to connect an ILEC's own switches with its own unbundled loops serves no valid commercial purpose, but additional information, which only Ameritech holds, is needed to more fully evaluate this issue. The "three points" and the "extensive documentation" which you outline in your letter thus fail to address the questions posed in my letter.

Further, your statement that I or anyone else from AT&T said we were not authorized to discuss AT&T's views is just plain wrong. We came to the meeting seeking clarification and detail around Ameritech's position, as indicated above. It is, after all, up to Ameritech to state how it proposes to make unbundled UNEs available to CLECs based upon the 8th Circuit's decision, before CLECs can determine how they might be combined. Additionally, however, we discussed preliminarily AT&T's proposal to utilize the "recent change process" to separate and reconnect Ameritech's unbundled loops and ports, although of course not in the level of detail that would be necessary to work through those issues. As indicated below, we are prepared to pursue those discussions.

Frankly, Bonnie, thinking back on this Ameritech's insistence upon attorney involvement in what should be business meetings, prior even to exploring the technical and operational issues, appears to be a big part of the problem. In an effort to proceed on a business to business level, I would suggest the following. First, I would appreciate a response to our questions included in my February 10, 1997 letter. Second, I propose we schedule a meeting to discuss AT&T's "recent change proposal" in greater detail, approximately a week subsequent to Ameritech's response to our questions. The meeting would be held without attorneys present. As indicated in Bill Davis's letter to John Lenahan on October 23, 1997. AT&T is prepared to pursue these discussions, without prejudice to either party's legal position, from an operational and business perspective. You are exactly right when you say these issues should be worked through the account team.

Your prompt written reply would be appreciated. Please call if you would like to discuss any aspect of this matter in greater detail.

Sincerely,


Bruce Bennett

Bernett

BB/cv

330 storm Uniters Street Floor 3 Chicago, IL 60654 Office 312/335-6531 Fex 312/467-9026

Theodore A. Edwards Vice President-Sales Local Exchange Carriers



March 16, 1998

VIA FAX: (312) 230-8834 & FIRST CLASS MAIL

Vice President - Central States Local Service Organization AT&T

227 West Monroe Street, 13th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing pursuant to Section 29.3 of the Interconnection Agreements under Sections 251 and 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 by and between Ameritech and AT&T (individually and collectively, the "Agreement") to require renegotiation of certain provisions of the Agreement in light of the final and nonappealable decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in Inwa Utilities Board v. F.C.C., 120 F.3d 753, (8" Cir. 1997), which decision vacated certain rules contained in Part 51 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations (such vacated rules referred to herein as the "Vacated Rules").

As you know, the Vacated Rules were in effect when the Agreement was negotiated, arbitra orl, signed and approved. Consistent with Section 29.3, the Eighth Circuit's final and nonappealable decision vacating the Vacated Rules gives rise to an "Amendment to the Act" (as defined in Section 29.3 he Agreement) and Ameritech therefore demands renegotiation of the provisions in the Agreement that were affected by such Amendment to the Act.

In keeping with the good faith requirement of Section 29.3, Ameritech requests that AT&T identify a point of contact to negotiate the amendment. Accordingly, please identify to me in writing by no later than March 23, 1998, AT&T's point of contact and I will have the applicable Ameritech of a negotiation team contact that individual.

If you have any questions, please call me at (312) 335-6531.

Sincerely,

ce: Bonnie Hemphill

7. a. Edward

AT&T Vice President - Law & Government Affairs

VIA FAX: (312) 230-8835

TOTAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF

13,



Philip S. Abrahams Senior Attorney

March 23, 1998

13th Floor 227 West Monroe Street Chicago, Illinois 60606 312 230-2645

Via Fax and U.S. Mail

Mr. Michael J. Karson
Vice President & General Counsel
Ameritech Information Industry Services
350 North Orleans
Floor 5
Chicago, IL 60654

Dear Mike:

This is in response to Ted Edwards' March 16, 1998 letter proposing that our companies renegotiate certain provisions of the Interconnection Agreement in Eight of the "final and nonappealable" decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Since Ted's letter is not explicit, please submit to me, in writing, the specific provisions of the Interconnection Agreement that you wish to renegotiate and indicate the basis for that request (i.e., please cross-reference those provisions to the "final and nonappealable" portions of the Eighth Circuit's decision). Upon receipt, AT&I can both determine if our companies are in agreement with the status of the portion(s) of the order in question and how to move forward under Section 29.3 of the Interconnection Agreement.

Sincerely,

Philip S. Abrahams

cc: Ted Edwards - Ameritech Jane Medlin Bill West

NOTEBAERT SAYS AMERITECH CAN'T FOLLOW FCC SEC. 271 'ROAD MAP'

CHICAGO -- Although Ameritech initially was enthusiastic about FCC development of "road map" for RHCs to use in meeting requirements for long distance entry, company has found after further study that it's "impossible" to follow those directions, Ameritech Chmn. Richard Notebaert told reporters Tues. in news conference here. He said Ameritech has decided it can't file any more entry applications until it determines whether new FCC members will have different interpretation of Telecom Act checklist requirements. He gave keynote speech at USTA convention here earlier in day.

Road map is nickname for guidance included in FCC order in Aug. denying Ameritech's Sec. 271 request to offer long distance in Mich. In that order, Commission outlined what RHC needed to do to win approval of application. Ameritech last summer hailed that action as victory for RHCs because FCC never before had issued directions to meet checklist.

However, on closer study company discovered it would have to spend at least \$200 million and more than year's work to meet some requirements involving billing, operational support systems and certain technical details of interconnection, Notebaert said. He said guidelines would require changes in billing system – for example, to accept 6 entries instead of 2 -- and information that isn't even available now. He said company is waiting to see whether FCC will clarify problem when it rules on BellSouth's Sec. 271 petition in Dec. Ameritech officials said they have held many meetings with FCC staff in effort to resolve problem but haven't received any assurance that revisions will be made.

Ameritech also is hesitant to file for Sec. 271 entry until it determines how newly constituted FCC will interpret recent ruling by 8th U.S. Appeals Court, St. Louis, on unbundled elements and shared transport, Notebaert said. He said court's language on rebundling was "very straightforward" but so was its earlier language on forward-looking pricing that FCC interpreted in way that RHCs found questionable. In pricing case, FCC had continued to apply forward-looking pricing principles in reviewing Sec. 271 applications, action that RHCs have challenged in court. Because of uncertainty at federal level, Ameritech "isn't pushing very hard" to win state approval for long distance entry, Notebaert said.

In his speech at USTA convention, Notebaert urged telcos to be "imaginative" and "bold" in facing newly competitive world. Like other speakers' at this year's sessions (see separate story, this issue), his comments almost took form of pep talk to smaller companies. He said that increased competition in cellular market helped Ameritech by encouraging it to try harder to meet customers' needs and to offer digital cellular service quickly. As result, he said, Ameritech has experienced 30% annual growth rate. By being "bold" and entering cable market when some predicted failure, Ameritech is "winning more than a third of the cable households where our service is up and running," he said.

Notebaert said that meeting customer needs is best way to compete: "Our future is in the hands of our customers. Nothing has more bearing on our ability to prosper than to see the world through their eyes." He said some in audience might point out that they didn't offer cellular or couldn't see getting into cable since they count customers only "in the thousands." Notebaert warned that "that kind of thinking is the path to oblivion" and all companies must "unshackle our imaginations and, as we like to say at Ameritech, look at this business through the windshield rather than the rear-view mirror."

CDviaNewsEDGE

Copyright (c) 1997 Warren Publishing, Inc. Received by NewsEDGE/LAN: 10/28/97 7:54 PM

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Review of Ameritech)	
Ohio's Economic Costs for Interconnection,)	
Unbundled Network Elements, and Recipro-)	Case No. 96-922-TP-UNC
cal Compensation for Transport and Termi-)	
nation of Local Telecommunications Traffic.	ĺ	

SECOND ENTRY ON REHEARING

The Commission finds:

- (1) On June 19, 1997, the Commission issued an Opinion and Order addressing in detail the total element long run incremental cost (TELRIC) studies submitted by Ameritech Ohio (Ameritech) in this matter. These TELRIC studies were intended to establish the rates for unbundled network elements which Ameritech proposes to charge competitors for provisioning unbundled network elements as required by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (1996 Act) and this Commission's local service guidelines set forth in Case No. 95-845-TP-COI (845 Guidelines).
- (2) On September 18, 1997, the Commission issued an Entry on Rehearing modifying and clarifying, to the limited extent addressed therein, the June 19, 1997 Opinion and Order.
- (3) On October 20, 1997, applications for rehearing of the Commission's September 18, 1997 Entry on Rehearing were timely filed by Ameritech, AT&T Communications of Ohio (AT&T), and MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI)² pursuant to Section 4903.10, Revised Code, and Rule 4901-1-35, Ohio Administrative Code. Memoranda contra the applications for rehearing were timely filed by Ameritech and jointly by AT&T and MCI.
- (4) In their joint application for rehearing, AT&T and MCI aver that the Commission erred in its September 18, 1997 Entry on Rehearing concerning the application of the 20 percent reduction in shared costs. AT&T and MCI allege that, rather than adopt their position and reduce the shared cost percentage

Codified as 47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.

Consistent with their earlier practices in this matter, AT&T and MCI submitted a joint application for rehearing.